DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 111 731 SO 008 575

AUTHOR Pellow, Deborah; Bedger, Jean E.
TITLE Social Ecology of South Commons. Final Report on Work Completed for the Office of Child Development, Planning Grant OCD-CB-486 (6/1/73-3/3/74).
INSTITUTION Council for Community Services in Metropolitan Chicago, Ill.
PUB DATE [74]
NOTE 44p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS City Planning; City Problems; *Community Study; Environmental Influences; Ethnic Groups; *Inner City; School Role; Social Influences; *Socialization; *Social Sciences; Socioeconomic Influences; *Sociology
IDENTIFIERS Illinois (Chicago)

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research is to determine if it is possible to build an inner-city community with socioeconomic and racial mix and have it work. The findings from a study carried out in the Near Southside Chicago community of South Commons, built in the late 50's are presented. Methodology included informal conversations, interviews with adult residents of all income levels and ethnicities, and observation of children. Findings show that inner group conflict is a function of class difference rather than race, and physical design and landscaping reflect such differences and exacerbate them; and that the school is fundamentally pivotal to interaction and community organization because as a sociophysical institution it has the quality of bringing together rich and poor. Four hypotheses for further work emerge from the study. Among these are that persons moving into a community out of desire to live in a mixed setting would be more committed to the specifically attracting features, and that institutions directly affecting children are fundamental to community stability and cohesion. (Author/RM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED111731

SOCIAL ECOLOGY OF SOUTH COMMONS

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: SO UD
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

Final Report on Work Completed for the
Office of Child Development
Planning Grant OCD-CB-486
(6/1/73 - 3/3/74)

SO008575

Prepared by:
Deborah Pellow, Project Director
Jean E. Bedger, Research Director

Council for Community Services in Metropolitan Chicago
64 East Jackson Boulevard
Chicago, Illinois 60604

SOCIAL ECOLOGY OF SOUTH COMMONS

INTRODUCTION

> Chicago was a place where people initially came to make money. But it must also have that element in it that makes living in it an experience. Slum clearance hasn't improved it. They have substituted a more sanitary type of squalor. It is not a shantytown any more, but possibly something worse. It is based on the mistaken premise that you can create a home environment if you give people all the "sanitary" necessities; that you therefore create an atmosphere in which they feel they can live. This is not true. While no one regrets the vanishing of the old slums, we also remember we once had neighborhoods. They have vanished too. Without them, there can be no such thing as a city to which one feels held ... In modern life everything works against the neighborhood idea. We are now a race of nomads. (Terkel 1969:261)

Is it possible to build an inner-city community, with socio-economic and racial mix, and have it work? Formerly, immigrants and in-migrants gravitated to areas which were becoming populated by their own people. Nationality groups claimed their respective territories as they arrived, like attracting like. They established local networks of friends, neighbors, relatives; oftimes, as in traditional towns, the three were coincident. (Keller 1968) Much of the homogeneity of life-styles, values and attitudes were fostered by the whole of the environment. Families amongst immigrants and Blacks tended to be extended in structure. The spirit of cooperation and sharing was engendered by mutuality of concern. Within this context, a child grew up as part of a whole system, into which his home life fed.

In recent years, there has been a renewed interest in a return to the old-style community, but with the new twist of heterogeneity, in both the human (social) and non-human (physical) environments. This paper presents the findings from a study carried out in the Near Southside Chicago community of South Commons. The site was chosen because it combines the three attributes of being planned, heterogeneous and located in the inner-city. The analysis is based upon preliminary work, carried out in the Summer of 1973. The original objective was to investigate the possibility of doing a systematic, long-term project; thus, the findings may be considered of a tentative nature.

The project has two foci: the social construction of community, in socio-spatial terms, and the community as an instrument of socialization. In planning living spaces, the spatial need of people must be considered; these are patterned obstructions that transcend individual differences

and are integrated into the social matrix where they occur. William H. Whyte spent two years observing the use of playgrounds, park spaces and street in New York City. His conclusion was "many people actually like the city ... and if they come together in the crowded areas it is often because they want to... [W]henever any sort of decent open space is provided, they will quickly make it into a very sociable place." (1972:20)

One's relation to his immediate surroundings will influence his relation to the larger world. A combination of architectural and spatial designs executed in a common area allows for people with different tastes and spatial needs to come together. The result is a more heterogeneous population. The question remains: does this necessarily promote interaction? Does it have any effect on attitudes that members of different socio-economic and ethnic groups have toward each other?

> The literature on local communities has repeated references to the conception of the neighborhood as the province of children. It is the neighborhood within which an individual first establishes meaningful relationships outside of the nuclear family and establishes attachments which even later in life will be generalized to the neighborhood of one's youth. (Hunter 1970:142).

It is suggested that as a child grows up, his perceptions are, to a large degree, a product of his local environment; his socialization results not only from conscious manipulation by parents and teachers, but also from accumulated impressions of interactions experienced or exposed to daily.

If the physical environment is planned to accommodate a mixture of cultural-specific idiosyncrasies, life-styles and people, then the social environment can be extended to erode xenophobia and/or ethnocentrism. This in turn would create a base for heterogeneous interaction. If the adults who move into such a community are interested in these ideal qualities of life, and since the immediate environment (but beyond the parental bound) has a direct effect upon the child's development, one might conclude that the child will develop liberal attitudes. The community of influence, however, is not limited to the architects' and planners' physical design. Beyond planning, there is the existence of levels (or areas) of inclusiveness; this is the model which has emerged from the project.

There is the planned area designated as the community of South Commons. But there is also the planned sub-community of owned

townhouses; of upper-income apartments making up Oxford Mall, Stratford Mall and Windsor, and of moderate income York Terrace. Finally, beyond the planned boundaries, there is the larger community, of which South Commons is a part.

Originally, South Commons was considered unique, in that its plan combined architectural variety, spaces for public and private life, and accommodated a racially and socio-economically-mixed population. Preliminary work shows the situation to be somewhat different.

It appears that the sub-clusters are the socio-spatial basis for the direct networks of the children while the community at large (of which South Commons is a part) is the basis for the less direct, though perhaps not less influential, outside networks.

The informalities of meeting and greeting on common spatial ground, sharing common recreational facilities, meeting at the store, etc., along with the formal activities, such as visiting at one another's homes, provide the child with exposure to people and life-styles, as a matter of course. The impingement of outside ecological systems (networks) becomes a significant influence as well. Along with more formal socialization, these two systems of networks are converted into a system of values, attitudes and behavior.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Community, in the old sense, had been taken for granted until it began to disappear -- encouraged by the Melting Pot philosophy, slum clearance, expansion of suburbs, increased mobility through better transportation and communication facilities, nucleated shopping areas. In the old community, informalities of daily life created networks -- people met and greeted on the street, they patronized the same local merchants, they maintained similar life-styles. The network, however, definitely did have ties to the physical space as well. It functioned in ways which must now be fulfilled through imposed institutions; for example, there was a fearlessness in the street life of established neighborhoods, where eyes were trained toward the streets out of concern for one another. (Jacobs 1961) Caring for neighbors' children or property has been replaced by nurseries and policing.

As the children of immigrants came into their own, tradition gave way to the American Way. Rugged individualism and the institution of the nuclear family took over. Single families became isolated. Assimilation (accompanying the demise of the homogeneous community) and insularity became partners in the life-style of Middle America. Much of this was fostered and/or created in the guise of the aesthetics of clearance. Throughout urban America, private and governmental bodies have created new, homogeneous communities. Social disorganization and disorientation were generated in two ways: uprooting neighborhood

people, who suffer great angst, missing not only social ties but meaningful physical ties as well (Fried 1963; Gans 1962); and relocating members of other communities. These latter "communities", as their developers choose to call them, are housing projects. They have done nothing more than to herd together a group of people who share racial and socio-economic victimization. (See Weaver 1963)

The concept of "natural areas", i.e., areas of population segregation which are not products of conscious design, came out of the Chicago school of human ecology. Growing out of Durkheim's work in societal differentiation (1933), the approach was to study

> the spatial and temporal relations of human beings as affected by the selective, distributive, and accommodative forces of the environment... These spatial relationships of human beings are the products of competition and selection, and are continuously in the process of change as new factors enter to disturb the competitive relations or to facilitate mobility. Human institutions and human nature itself become accommodated to certain spatial relationships of human beings. As these spatial relationships change, the physical basis is altered, thereby producing social and political problems. (Mackenzie 1925:63f.)

Human communities come into existence as natural areas, to perform a function. As in a slum, the function may be contrary to popular (middle class) taste. The combined unique properties of the natural areas make the city an organic whole. (viz., Smith and White, eds. 1939) The natural community is bonded and bounded by a grass roots homogeneity. Its social configuration grows out of the interlacing of personal networks, which induces a sense of cohesiveness. The network nurtures social and spatial identification with people and places.

In recent years, the interrelatedness of man and his environment has piqued new interest. This time the level of investigation is behavioristic and micro- rather than macro-sociological. Basic to current theoretical assumptions is the concept of territoriality. Territory has been defined by Hediger and following him Sommer as an area "which is first rendered distinctive by its owner in a particular way and secondly, is defended by the owner." (Sommer 1969:14, f.n. 5) Territoriality is a behavioral system characteristic of all living organisms, and has four distinct features: 1) claim to an area, 2) a bubble (the space immediately surrounding one's integument), 3) social/spatial distancing (aggression is regulated by hierarchic organization and spacing), 4) sensitivity to environmental pressure. (Hall 1966)

Sommer (1969) suggests that adaptation to shared space is seen in the complementary nature of territorality and dominance. When each person possesses his own space, his reasons for dominating others disappears. The social order is maintained through the complex interweaving of individual ownership, communal ownership and status. The need for territory, and which kind, is tied to the individual's need for identity. There are two germane aspects to territorial behavior: the first concerns what Hall (1966) terms proxemics -- how man structures his micro-space.* The individual's proxemic behavior occurs out-of-awareness. It is a combination of cultural conditioning and individual uniqueness. In different cultures (and, it turns out, sub-cultures), people relate differently to each other and to their surroundings in spatial terms-- for example, the choice of housing, the manner of arranging furniture, the more general orientation of planners who lay out streets and place buildings, the factor of physical proximity and or ties to common spaces foster groupings. The community need not have externally-imposed boundaries; they may be socially constructed, partially, through usage of space. (1966)

The second area of research concerns the individual, as a member of a group, as he relates to a more externally-defined space. This began somewhat as an attempt to record the before-and-after situation of slum clearance victims. The neo-ecologists are dealing here with local, sub-cultural differences. For example, Rainwater (1966) notes that an individual's self-image is reinforced by his surroundings. Residents in the new-style ghettos (housing projects) see the filth and/or discrepancies internalize this and take it to reflect upon their self-worth. Beyond this, orientations toward housing standards and the needs that the house fulfills vary along social and racial group lines. (See also Demerath 1962; Fried and Levin 1968; Heberle 1960)

Architectural and interior design, in conjunction with the implementation of space, has been shown to affect interpersonal interaction (Carey and Mapes 1972; O. Newman 1972) Robert Sommer (1967) has demonstrated that the furniture arrangement in a mental hospital can totally destroy the patterns of interaction that hospital therapy is supposed to promote. (See also Loring 1956; Parr 1966; Sivadon 1956)

Albert Scheflen, a psychiatrist at Bronx State Hospital, notes that one must "remember about ethnic differences in space planning, that these are limited by an original custom of land allocation and building, which was primarily Anglo-American and other people have to live in this.

---

*Hall's work is out of the mainstream of research and as yet in its early stage of development, thus it is often written off as irrelevant or theoretically unsound (Viz., Edmund Leach's review in the New York Review of Books, 28 May, 1968)

They can only change it so much. The fact is that peoples' 'special needs' are not in the main accommodated." *Mr. Imoagene (1972) in his paper on urban renewal in Ibadan (a traditional, native urban center) and Sepele (a new town) shows how renewal failed when experts did not take into account certain basic factors, such as family structure and ideology: that the people involved do not want to live separately (as opposed to living in extended family houses), or that they do not want to leave the site of the ancestral home or grave.

> There are those who argue for the high rise and an equal number who condemn it just as strongly. Unfortunately, the question is usually seen almost solely in terms of density, and yet density turns into a chimera as soon as it is examined closely... The fact is that density cannot be taken out of its context or even adequately considered apart from such things as social organization, child raising techniques, the enculturation devices used by a group, discipline (internal and external), informal organization, sensitivity to materials, need for screening of the various senses and the significance of the buildings themselves as a communication to the people who live in them. (Hall 1971:249)

Black families, time and again have been depicted as anomalous vis-a-vis "The American way of life": several generations as well as several lines of persons may be living together, offspring of kin are incorporated, the household head is often a woman and the household matri-centric, men are peripheral, and so on. Could it not be possible that such "anomalous" forms of social organization are a continuation of traditional life-style, carried from the tribal context to the plantation and surviving even today as part of the cultural baggage? Ethnic or racial groups which continue to maintain the basic ideology associated with extended family organization and living conditions, in conjunction with mitigating economic circumstances (such as the need to pool resources) have problems with housing which does not accommodate the extended family.

High-rise living sometimes works. In the right location, and with the right class definition, it is highly prestigious. "The major difference (between high-rise and single-family-home living) is you can't open your back door and shove the kids in the back yard to play" remarks one Chicago mother, which means taking the children out to play. "I find that living in a high-rise actually brings a family much closer together... I don't want the children walking around the neighborhood after dark or running around the building, so we do a lot together" says another. (Patricia Anstett Sun Times Sept. 26, 1972)

---

*Personal communication

Both of these cases reflect the circumstances of middle-class parents. "The high rise apartment appears to reflect white family structure, and when it needs to be built for other groups, it should be adapted to indigenous cultural needs." (Hall 1971:428) Moreover, "the introduction of a large grouping of new buildings of distinctive height and texture into an existing urban fabric singles out these buildings for particular attention. If this distinctive image is also negative, the project will be stigmatized and its residents castigated and victimized." (Newman 1972:102) Conceptions of the house are generalized to the area surrounding. (Rainwater 1966) Thus, for the lower class, the house is a shelter from external threats, and it satisfies needs if it provides enough room and little danger. Danger in the environment may be non-human or human. Rainwater postulates three interrelated interpersonal consequences: 1) the need to form satisfying interpersonal relationships; 2) the need to exercise responsibility as a family member; and 3) the need to formulate explanation for an unpleasant state of affairs in one's world with the sense of home as a safe place, boundaries of safety can be pushed further out; the measured degree of publicness in the building also contributed to a sense of security.

It is this very notion which O. Newman (1972) refers to as "defensible space": "...a surrogate term for the range of mechanisms -- real and symbolic barriers, strongly defined areas of influence, and improved opportunities for surveillance -- that combine to bring an environment under the control of its residents". (3) It can be made to operate in an evolving hierarchy "from level to level in the collective human habitat -- to extend from apartment to street."

A considerable number of studies have been done to determine the relative importance of ecologically local networks; the data show that they are significant among lower and working classes. (Demerath 1962; Fried and Levin 1968; Heberle 1960; Rainwater 1966; Wilner et al. 1962) "The presence or absence of a particular design should have a variant effect on the total social life of a particular group, depending on the interdependence of the architecturally-related behavior to other dimensions of the group's life. More specifically, we should find that the architectural relationships between dwellings and the effects of such spatial relationships on the social relationships that develop between families will have varying degress of significance, depending on the importance of informal neighborhood relationships in a particular social group." (Yancey, 1971:4)

Furthermore, the range of people from different socio-economic backgrounds who can live together amicably is much lower than one would expect. (Gans 1972) Group territoriality is often expressed in national

and local boundaries -- a segregation which reduces conflict. "Because social and spatial orders serve similar functions, it is not surprising to find spatial correlates of status levels and, conversely, social correlates of spatial positions." (Sommer 1969:17) For example, elites may have larger homes, more rooms, spatial mobility to escape.

The analysis of the situation at South Commons confirms all of the foregoing. For one thing, the planned differences (certainly for income groups included) within South Commons and between South Commons and the surrounding population appear to have a ceiling. Within the new community, there is a very distinct difference between the socio-spatial needs of those in the upper-income bracket and those in the moderate-income bracket. Many of both were attracted by the same general features: the general area, the housing and the planned nature of the community (including services and institutions). The difference lies more in the specific features of these more general categories -- and disenchantment when these specifics have not worked out as expected. All of this is discussed in the next section.

Hannerz (1973) suggests that urban analysis must relate the small social worlds (the cultural diversity) to the organization of the whole. This necessitates knowing the unique features or urbanism, i.e., heterogeneity (of different sub-cultures, ethnic, occupation, residential, or whatever); sparse networks (that people are not interacting as they did in more homogeneous surroundings; but are more clustered); and fluidity (the constant change in social relationships).

Each group of the social order exerts some influence, both over its own members and through a percolating effect, upon outsiders. The degree of influence is a function of the status of the group in question. Members of each group are tied together in a network. The essence of network includes the qualities of size, geographic spread, class and race; it is physically anchored -- that is, certain spaces are associated with certain activities and interactants.

The social network has a history of usage in the behavioral studies. At first, its use as a representation of a complex sort of interrelationships was metaphorical; Radcliffe-Brown defined social structure as "a network of actually existing social relationships." (1952:190) The use of network analysis as a mathematic but non-quantitative method to discern the relationships among a set group of people was advanced by Barnes (1954), in his study of a Norwegian Parish. By strictly defining the linkages between people, and by finding specific ties which reveal their social behavior and its meaning, Barnes, and later Bott (1957), were able to distill meaning from the inter-relationships of the respective populations they considered. The sociometric

approach of focusing attention on the characteristics of personal linkages has been used to study clique formation, leadership and task performance (Festinger, Schachter and Bach 1950) Social psychologists have used network analysis to better understand communication by plotting the linkages along which rumors, ideas and information flow.

All of these studies are examples of how the metaphor of a social network is expanded and made analytically useful. Mitchell (1969) notes that other people or groups not directly in contact with an individual's network may also be influential and must be taken into account. He quotes Nadel (1957:16), who emphasizes the fact that what happens between a set of people must affect what happens between other adjacent ones.

Children, as agents of community organization, are tied together in networks. Home and school have a direct influence on child development. Thus far, most social psychological studies along these lines have dealt with the family as the primary socializing agent. (Symonds 1946; Sears 1957; Maccoby 1960; Bonnfenbrenner 1965; Mussen et al 1963: and two longitudinal studies -- Kagan and Moss 1962; Macfarlane 1938) Disciples of Freud and Piaget have concentrated on the child's early years in the home; sociologists have dealt with value systems inculcated. Kohn (1959) shows how the working class and middle class parent each tries to develop skills in the child which would be needed as an adult of that class.

There has been some, though not much, research into the influence of school on behavior and outlook -- and this with contradictory findings. (Armor 1972; Coleman 1966; Rosenfeld 1967; Stodolsky and Jensen 1970; Jencks et al 1972).

> Where performance deviates from that expected, explanation is often sought in terms of deficits in parent-child interaction or learning opportunities, or of misfit between values taught at home and at school. Little consideration is given to the contribution that the school makes by <u>its</u> values, <u>its</u> learning opportunities, and teacher-child relationship -- school is not seen as an <u>active</u> socializing agent exerting an effect independent of that of the home. (Himmelweit and Swift 1969:155)

Even less consideration has been accorded the influence of the community, as a total environment, on child development. With respect to the South Commons Study, the community-as-socializer is the local, informal network of relationships. This includes the differential importance of adult versus younger person or peer in socialization of

attitudes. Following the impetus of Freudian and behavior theory, Child points out that "... the effects upon a child of socialization by an adult may differ from those of socialization by an older child. Interaction with the parent may have different effects from similar interaction with a non-relative." (1954:687) Two issues are relevant here: one is the general differentiation of adult and youngster in terms of status, as socializers; the second refers directly to the South Commons situation -- namely, given differences in attitudes of different children's parents, how are children's attitudes toward each other affected?

Child remarks that there is indirect evidence "... that the status of the main socializer is an important determinant of behavior toward other persons and objects." (1954:687) Is the family the main socializer? For example, Helen Trager and Marion Yarrow (1952) and Charles Bird, et al (1952) dismiss the notion of a one-to-one relation between children's attitudes and those of their parents. Evidence has been assembled to show that there is a great diversity of attitudes among parents regarding Negroes with a consequent subjection of many children to conflicting forces within the home. It has not been claimed that the conditions within the home are the only ones accounting for differences in attitudes between parents and their children. Using as a reference point the agreement or disagreement regarding the limitation of play activities of white and Negro children, we have portrayed families more in agreement than disagreement, but disparities have been marked.

Children who say their parents have told them not to play with Negroes are more prejudiced than children who have not been aware of outspoken restraint. If parents say they have discouraged their children and the children say they have not been aware of either parent making spoken prohibitions, the mean scores of these children usually will not differ significantly from those whose parents say they have not discouraged play contacts. Children, however, will be more prejudiced toward Negroes if they assign conflicting roles to parents, and the parents actually disagree with each other about the discouragement of play activities. Boys are not as prejudiced as girls, except when both boys and girls say they have been told not to play with Negro children. (Bird, Monachesi and Burdick 1952:306)

In her study of racial attitudes among Black and white preschool children, Judith Porter (1961) discusses agents of attitude transmission. She commences with the importance of the family, in terms of internalization of norms, values and behavior patterns. These may be transmitted directly (through instruction) or indirectly (overheard conversation, behavioral cues). However, she goes on to include as equally important "the comments of peers; exposure to stereotypes in mass media and literature; spontaneous color associations; and observation of role

occupancy. ... Although the mechanisms which transmit attitudes are similar for all children, the extent of these feelings and the reaction to them is affected by the child's psychological and sociological environment and his racial membership." (1971:21)

Of fundamental importance to the South Commons study has been initiation of an assessment of socio-spatial design, as it affects interaction: its socio-petal quality (i.e., bringing people together) versus socio-fugal quality (of inhibiting interaction). Environmental design places constraints upon peoples' activity - what Perin calls "competence in carrying out everyday behavior." The central source of data is people's own evaluation of their sense of competence and objective measures of it, relative to the availabilities, extent, quality, and placement of environmental resources. The very process of design is then to be conceived as a responsor to the stimuli of human demands." (1970:45)

Neighborhood cohesion was said earlier to be a function of networks. Children are pivotal; William Whyte (1956) says that neighborhood cohesion is due to children. "There are so many of them and they are so dictatorial in effect that a term like "filiarchy" would not be entirely facetious. It is the children who set the basic design. Their friendships are translated into the mother's friendships and these, in turn, to the family's. Find where the flow of wheeled juvenile traffic is, and you will find the outlines of the wives' kaffee klatsch routes. Sight and sound are important. When they go visiting, they gravitate towards the houses within sight of their children and within hearing of the telephone and these lines of sight crystallize into the 'checkerboard movement'". (1956)

On the other hand, second-order effects (deriving from the peripheral community) are significant in the child's socialization. This is spelled out in Nadel's discussion of "network": "... I do not merely wish to indicate the 'links' between persons; this is adequately done by the word relationship. Rather, I wish to indicate the further linkage of the links themselves and the important consequence that, what happens so-to-speak between one pair of 'knots' must affect what happens between other adjacent ones." (Nadel 1957:16)

If moderately rich and moderately poor, Black and white, tenant and owner, are brought together, such that they share public spaces in common; if their daily perambulations bring them together on the public walk or store; if their children not only attend school together, but share common recreational facilities and turf -- then what kind of effect can we expect this to have on the development of the children? Can we expect more liberal attitudes toward heterogeneity and less prejudice?

Studies of prejudice (Lohman and Reitzes 1952, 1954; Reitzes 1953) have shown that in organization situations, Blacks and whites work together; after hours, however, they leave and they go their separate ways. In this study, Williams and Stabler have found that children "develop a tendency toward the positive evaluation of white and negative evaluation of Black before they start kindergarten." (1973:51)

Results from tests of color association and self-concept in Louisiana and in Atlanta, Georgia, show that there is a correlation between children's attitudes toward colors and attitudes towards themselves and towards others. "Although the data are less consistent for Afro children than for Euro children, we found that by the time they are four, many Afro children gathered the unfavorable attitudes of the larger society into their own psychological make-up." (Williams & Stabler 1973:52) Furthermore, there are no regional differences on color meaning tests. "By the time children are six years old, it is a rare child who does not display some degree of the white-is-good, Black-is-bad concept." (Williams & Stabler 1973:52)

Study Site

In 1924, the Chicago Community Research Committee formally sub-divided the city of Chicago into community areas. One such community area is known as Douglas. It is bounded to the west by the Dan Ryan Expressway (actually by Federal Street), which is the first street to the east by the Lake, and to the south by Pershing Road, (3900 S.) from the western line to Vincennes and over to 35th Street. It is one of the oldest communities in the city, fully incorporated in 1863. Senator Stephen A. Douglas, after whom it was named, bought 70 acres in 1852; ten acres of this was donated to the University of Chicago, and another ten acres facing this to be developed as two residential parks. Douglas was primarily interested in developing a middle-class area, while housing for workmen at the local soap and rendering works was also erected.

The community of Douglas was close to the Lake, convenient to transportation, a major business street; it developed into a fashionable residential district. By 1900, however, it began to decline. Old residents moved, apartment buildings were built and Black residents began to move into Douglas. By 1920, the community was 74% Black; and with steady influx of residents by 1950 it was 97% Black. The total population of Douglas jumped nearly 50% in the 1940's as a result of the Black migration (1940: 53,124 of which 49,804 were Negro; 1950: 78,745, of which 76,421 were Negro). Due to the revolutionary housing development, the Black proportion diminished slightly by 1960, while the white population doubled, concentrated within one housing development.

From the early 1940's to the present, there has been massive urban renewal in Douglas. Over the course of a century, it has gone from elegance

to slum, to redevelopment. The schemes have been under the auspices of either Chicago Housing Authority or Chicago Land Clearance Commission. In the early 1940's Chicago Housing Authority erected a 1658-unit housing project (Ida B. Wells Homes), in the southeast corner, to replace deteriorated brownstones and Victorian mansions. Later in the decade, Illinois Institute of Technology and Michael Reese Hospital - both located in Douglas - began working for clearance and extension of facilities in their immediate surroundings. The 1950's saw the construction of three Chicago Housing Authority projects - Dearborn Homes, Prairie Courts and Stateway Gardens, and subsequent extension.

The Chicago Housing Authority projects are over 90% Black and lower income housing, Chicago Land Clearance Commission's developments are primarily middle and upper income housing, and area redevelopment "as a mixture of residential, institutional, light industrial and commercial, and park land uses." (Kitagawa & Tauber 1963:84). Thus, Chicago Land Clearance Commission's Lake Meadows was built in the early 1950's as its first redevelopment project in Douglas and has ten apartment buildings, a shopping center, school, commercial building, and parks. It is 75% Black. Prairie Shores, built in 1962, along the lakefront, has three apartment buildings and a shopping center; it is 20% Black. These two complexes have 3825 rental units at a range of $85 to $400-plus, per unit. Many of the occupants of Prairie Shores are on the staffs of hospitals in the area. Illinois Institute of Technology includes in its complex 356 apartment units in four high-rise buildings.

In 1958, the Department of Urban Renewal began acquiring the 30.6 acres, which make up the site of South Commons. It is bounded on the north by 26th Street, on the east by Prairie Avenue, on the south by 31st Street, and on the west by Michigan Avenue. It is three miles south of Chicago's downtown area and less than one mile west of the lake. (see Map 1)

Two of the criteria for awarding a contract to develop the area were "the degree to which Proposal (sic) would result in a Balanced Residential Development with Integrated Neighborhood Shopping Facilities and with Harmonious Relationships to the Surrounding Community". (DUR 1964:6) As part of the bidding documents it was indicated that: "The objective of the redevelopment plans for these projects is to provide for predominantly residential use, with community facilities to allow development of a complete neighborhood environment for families of moderate income". (DUR 1964:6)

Four separate groups bid for the land, including an active group from Prairie Courts, the housing project just across Prairie Avenue, that wanted that land used as an extension of Prairie Courts; Ferd Kramer, who built Prairie Shores, wanted it for expensive housing; and McHugh and Levin submitted their plan, for South Commons. The latter was accepted

because, beyond the basics of financing and architectural soundness, it would provide housing for moderate and middle-income families in a variety of residential types.

At the time of purchase, the land contained 181 structures, housing 306 families and 224 single persons. Those families displaced by urban renewal would be balanced out by accommodating others of the same income group. Residents were relocated and ground was broken in Fall, 1966.

The plan incorporated both racial balance (60% white, 40% black) and socio-economic mix (60% upper income, 40% moderate). It was a unique community in conception, design and composition. "It's an experiment and a marvelous one", says sociologist Morris Janowitz, of the University of Chicago, "in that it involves planning not merely for physical but for social and educational purposes as well." (M. W. Newman 1969)

The shopping/community area is the focal point, from which the residential subareas extend. There are sequences of public and semi-public spaces, decorated with sculpture and flowers, as well as a variety of recreational and green areas. (see Map 2.) Variety in types of residence were designed and built for further liveability and interest. There is limited access for motorized traffic; paths abound; and there is a pedestrian overpass to the community center. The latter houses the elementary and preschool, hence children need not cross major streets to and from the center for school or other activities housed therein.

There are three types of housing: 1) for rent: high-rise apartments for both upper and moderate income groups, 2) for rent: low-rise apartments for both upper and moderate income groups, 3) for sale: brick townhouses.

Sub-areas, or quadrants, have been designed for the rental and sale residences. There are four quadrants; they are separated socio-economically and geographically. The southeast quadrant, Oxford Mall, is luxury housing. It contains one 21-story high-rise, and two five-story apartment buildings, all grouped around a swimming pool. Windsor, the next quadrant north, contains a 24-story high-rise and two 5-story apartment buildings, and is also grouped around a swimming pool. Each of these quadrants contains a playing area for children, as well as benches along tree-lined walks. Main entrances face into the focal area. Across Indiana Avenue is Dunbar Park, with playground, ball-field, tennis courts and benches.

The community mall, with convenience services, supermarket, drug-store, restaurant, cleaners, furnishings store, sitting/strolling area, and community center divides the southern section of upper-income housing from the northern sub-areas of townhouses and moderate income housing.

The first townhouses were built along the northwest part of the complex, across from the central mall. Each has its own enclosed garden and patio. There is a choice between 3 or 4 bedroom models. They are grouped in quadrants, with front doors facing in; each quad has sitting and playing areas. Backyards face on to the street.

Moderate income housing lies across Indiana Avenue from the first set of townhouses, and across 28th Street from the shopping mall. It consists of a 21-story building and 4 and 5-story maisonettes (2-story townhouses on top of each other), which are grouped around a central depressed courtyard/play area. Apartment entrances are from the street, on the west facing the back-entrances of one row of townhouses.

The final sub-area, Stratford Mall, is in the north-east corner. It contains the 24-story subsidized apartment dwellings for the elderly, the newly-completed townhouses, and Stratford House, an upper-income 24-story apartment building. These structures are grouped around the third swimming pool. There are play areas for the children, and seating areas (ostensibly for the elderly) are off to the side.

The housing unit breakdown is as follows:

South Commons - Apartment Unit Breakdown

	Studios	1 BR	2 BR	3 BR	4 BR	Total
Townhouses (Conventional Mortgage)				76	14(study)	90
FHA 221(d)3 (Family Housing)	40	131	80	54	26	331
FHA 236 (Elderly Housing)	208	104				312
FHA 220 (Market Rate)	240	428	202	16		886
Total	488	663	282	146	40	1,619
% of Total	30.0	41.0	17.5	9.0	2.5	100%

NOTE: 1. Total number of units 1619

2. Number of subsidized units
221(d)3 and 236 643 or 40%
per agreement with Department of Planning

Associated Architects : Ezra Gordon
Jack Levin

L.R. Solomon
J.D. Cordwell

Divided up into upper and moderate income housing, with population estimates, the picture looks a bit different. This is particularly so, because the moderate income low-rise area houses many times more children than all of the other housing areas of South Commons put together. The following listings detail the actual number of housing units in each of the cluster areas. "Stage" refers to the sequence of building within the time period of the entire complex; "parcel" refers to the set-off area -- such as the townhouses or Oxford Mall -- herein referred to as cluster. An insinuation one might draw, and which is the basis for one of the hypotheses of the study, is that an area designed as a "parcel" and built that way was conceptualized as distinct from any other, in terms of physical and social space.

The Habitat Company, the management company newly-formed by the developers, has no exact count of people currently living in the community. Their office records include only partial data from the original application: building, apartment number, rent and name of household head, income. The number of children, for example, is not included; nor are the records updated with, e.g. the birth of new children, change in household personnel, etc. Thus, any population count is approximate. By considering studio occupancy as one person, one-bedroom as two, two-bedroom as three, and so on for the upper income; and then by considering three-bedroom as six and four-bedroom as seven for 221-d-3 (in accord with FHA policy, which insists that four-bedroom units house at least five children), -- the population is estimated at 3,664.

The following two pages give a detailed breakdown of upper-income and moderate-income housing. The list and accompanying chart of location of children* details the imbalance in amount of physical space proportionate to number of occupants (this is particularly evident in the case of children's play-space.) The moderate low-rise houses the bulk of the children, without providing for their spatial needs.

---

*The known counts of children were obtained from the swimming pool tags. Since FHA residents do not have automatic use of the pools as part of their rent, moderate housing counts of children are an estimate of the Habitat Company.

UPPER INCOME HOUSING

STAGE 1, parcel 1

Windsor: high rise
2901 S. Indiana

A1 building

Studios	60
1-bedroom	120
2-bedroom	20
	200 units
	22 children

B1 building

Studios	22
1-bedroom	31
2-bedroom	11
3-bedroom	4
	68 units
	7 known children

B2 building

Studios	22
1-bedroom	31
2-bedroom	11
3-bedroom	4
	7 known children

STAGE 2, parcel 4

Oxford Mall: high rise
3001 S. Indiana

A-2 building

Studios	46
1-bedroom	92
2-bedroom	69
	207 units
	37 known children

Oxford Mall: low rise
3021 S. Indiana

B-3 building

Studios	22
1-bedroom	31
2-bedroom	11
3-bedroom	4
	68 units
	9 known children

B-4 building 3041 S. Indiana

Studios	22
1-bedroom	31
2-bedroom	11
3-bedroom	4
	68 units
	12 known children

MODERATE INCOME HOUSING

STAGE 1, parcel 2

York Terrace: low rise
2700 block, S. Indiana
FHA 221-d-3 (Family Housing)

D1 (west) building

1-bedroom	5
3-bedroom	26
4-bedroom	14
	45 units

(40 with children ?)

DD1 (east) building

1-bedroom	6
3-bedroom	28
4-bedroom	12
	46

(40 with children ?)

York Terrace: high rise
2701 S. Indiana

C-1 building

Studios	40
1-bedroom	120
2-bedroom	80
	240 units

Rough estimate: 180 children

Total rough estimate: 350 children

FHA 236 (elderly housing)
STAGE 3

Cambridge Manor: high rise
2631 S. Indiana

Studios	208
1-bedroom	104
	312 units

No children

STAGE 1, parcel 3

Stuart Townhouses: 42
2700 - mid-2800
S. Michigan Avenue

STAGE 2, parcel 6

Stuart Townhouses: 30
2600 - 2700
S. Michigan Avenue

STAGE 3

St. James Townhouses: 18 (10 sold & occupied
2600 S. Indiana
Avenue

Townhouse totals:

3-bedroom	76
4-bedroom	14
	90 units

87 known children

STAGE 3

Stratford Mall: high rise
2605 S. Indiana

A-3 building

Studios	46
1-bedroom	92
2-bedroom	69
	207 units

26 known children

Levels of Inclusiveness

Three major insights grew out of the preliminary investigation.* They are presented as an introduction to the analysis of findings and expanded upon later. The first is related to a naive anticipation that a cooperative effort had been launched between the social and physical sciences: i.e. that the sociologists employed were brought in to investigate physical, socio-spatial needs (among others) of people who are representative of potential residents, as well as polling the perceptions of local populations. The Staff Report, of the Department of Urban Renewal, November 12, 1964, in its review of the subsequently-accepted proposal for South Commons, stated: "...this developer has included two sociologists as consultants for the duration of the development of such a program who would consult on the development and maintaining of an interracial character in the community." (6)

The two consulting sociologists determined that the basic issue "centers on the degree to which a proposal would achieve a balanced interracial community providing a variety of housing types and necessary community facilities. The immediate surrounding area cannot be called a neighborhood or a community at the present time, since there is not sufficient social vitality or social integration. Only by developing a balanced community with different age groups is it possible to have the human resources necessary for a viable community. With one recommendation, the South Commons project was designed with these objectives because it gives important recognition to family type arrangements." (Unsigned, undated letter to Department of Urban Renewal, in anticipation of the public hearing for disposition of the sites for development.)

Thus, it was assumed that they would have provided the architects with information germane to housing needs (vis-a-vis layout and amount of space) and community facilities (shopping areas, institutional amenities, etc.) which relate to ethnicity, family structure, etc. This was not found to be validated.

The second insight is that the boundaries of the community of influence -- the people and institutions influential in affecting behavior or development of attitudes -- do not necessarily coincide with the physical boundaries of South Commons. The effect of a community in socialization is still considered to be of major import. In our current thinking, the plan for the study of South Commons is as a focal point within an urban ethnography, rather than as a community unto itself. In the process of developing the methods by which the community could best be studied, with a primary focus upon the child, it has become increasingly apparent that the impact of South Commons upon the surrounding communities, and vice versa -- their interrelation and their antagonism -- is a burning issue. Differentiation of environmental

*Unless noted otherwise, the basis for analysis was culled from informal conversations, off-the-cuff remarks, and a sampling of interviews with adult residents of all income levels and ethnicities; this was complemented by observations of children at play in their home areas, the playground, Kiddie Kamp, etc.; and finally, conversations with neighborhood Youth Corps boys and girls from Prairie Courts.

design and social institutions between South Commons and the outside is as important to respective functioning as internal differentiation is to the planned community. This has dictated to us the fact that of immediate concern is to study South Commons as part of an urban dynamic.

The third major insight that has come out of this initial period of study is that the differences of class are profoundly manifest in the assertion of territorial rights. Class differences appear to be more instrumental in the scheme of interaction than race differences, with the subordinate asserting his rights in making himself a real presence, and scaring off the other. In the immediate situation, the entire system can be viewed thusly:

At its most complex, it includes the entire city of Chicago; at the next level, there is the Near South Side; the next level is the community area of Douglas; then the area of South Commons; and that is further broken down into sub-systems of mutually-exclusive neighborhoods or clusters, such as the townhouses, moderate income housing, luxury apartment dwellings, community building, and shared mall.

The residents of South Commons lie along a continuum of these levels of complexity. This is evident in their perceptions of their respective places in the system, and their actual behavior. There is also the important consideration of the constraints placed upon both perceptions and actual behaviors by the environmental design. Thus, our focus upon South Commons is tempered by the recognition that there can be no exclusion of those other interacting elements, such as neighborhood, public housing, the larger community, and the impact of city-wide policies.

Within South Commons, territorial boundedness has become an issue. The architect/planner allocated territory -- moderate housing was put in one area, housing for the elderly is off by itself, upper income housing is quite separate from the above two, and in itself clearly distinguished as renters and buyers. Finally, the public at large was planned out. And management has determined how that territory would be used; and in certain cases, even forced structural changes in the architect's plan. For example, the original 221-d-3 (FHA moderate income housing) plan had two courts of low-rise maisonettes. These had been planned to accommodate larger families. After the first was built and the units leased, the plans were changed to build a high rise rather than another court of maisonettes. The company wanted to reduce the number of family units (children) while accommodating the same number of people, adults. Management did this for the sake of ease of management.

The manner in which people use their space has become an issue as well. Time and again, the middle class architect/planner projects his ideology and bias into his plans for housing other people. "They have encouraged the development of extensive self-congratulation systems within the design professions. Rarely are design awards based on the

experiences of the building's users, or even a site visit by the busy panel members..." (Sommer 1969:5) Thus, early in June 1973, the St. Louis Housing Authority voted unanimously to close down Pruitt-Igoe, the massive public housing project. "The project, hailed as an architectural triumph and one of the most innovative and largest public housing complexes in the nation when it was built 18 years ago, today stands pockmarked with walls of broken and boarded windows..." (NY Times 6/10/73)

Furthermore, these same omniscient scientists-of-design transgress basic principles of turf, explicit in the demarcation of the old-style communities. After referring to the renewed housing areas as communities, they assume that the inherent spirit of identity is non-existent. To a certain extent, South Commons, for all of its deliberate planning is the modern version of the homogeneous community of fifty years ago. The major difference is that previously, the communities grew up, side by side, as mutually exclusive enclaves with little significant contact between them.

South Commons was conceived by a private developer, who felt no accountability for the how or where of the new project. Because it is viewed as intrusive -- the space might have been vacant, but it was not unused -- a dynamic of tension was in the making. A history of neighborhood use, particularly by local youngsters, has made it difficult to cordon it off. There are those who advocate accommodation to the surrounding people; there are those who want to maintain its position as an island-in-the-city. It is a complex situation to foster stability within a racially and socio-economically heterogeneous community. Perceptions of what South Commons is to its residents run the gamut of possibilities. But that notwithstanding, given the socio-physical location of South Commons, the experience of that community's children does not reduce to interaction amongst themselves alone. Furthermore, there are the sentiments of neighborhood people toward South Commons, as reflected in their own, and their children's behavior. This has been complicated by the feelers (compromises) which management has extended to the outside community. Reactions to the latter are in part responsible for the turnover in population which South Commons has experienced since glowing reports were first published four or five years ago.

South Commons has brought together people from all over Chicago, urban and suburban. Many, however, were already familiar with the area from having lived there -- for example, in Lake Meadows or Prairie Shores, both middle-class apartment complexes. Buying <u>into</u> the area, however, or renting at luxury prices is often a different matter.

As one townhouse resident said, most of her friends (who live in the north shore suburbs) "think that she is crazy" for owning a home in

such a bad neighborhood. She and her husband had lived in nearby Prairie Shores; their family outgrew the apartment, but they wanted to stay on the near south side, since it is so convenient to downtown Chicago.

Many others overlooked the surrounding area in opting to move in since South Commons is not only convenient, but also contains beautiful new housing. Individual needs for "a place to call one's own", for privacy and so forth, could be met. Upper and moderate income people all agree. For the well-to-do Blacks, living in an apartment or town-house represents status among their reference groups. Many middle-age and older couples, some retired, came as well -- apartment buildings are provided with amenities and facilities such as optional air-conditioning units and laundry facilities. For those in upper income housing, there is the included option of three swimming pools, and this is a major source of appeal for young and old alike -- although, interestingly enough, the pools are by no means over-used. Moderate income dwellers must pay for this. But, for them the appeal of inexpensive housing, in pleasant surroundings, has been an important factor.

All of this is part of the promotion of South Commons as a planned community: convenience shopping and services, community institutions, a racial mix, and that ambiguous sense of community esprit de corps, abetted by the community center and planned-in areas for social intecourse. It is different than many other inner-city neighborhoods, insofar as normal dangers are concerned, except that many people moved there because they wanted to remain in the city and saw South Commons as a panacea to problems of city-living. It remains unwalled, by plan not to be shut off from the general neighborhood -- although the six lane boulevard on one side, a police station on the corner, and a moving wall of security men help. The irony of the situation is that those very reasons for moving in became causes for moving out. But just as the specifics of attraction differed often along class and racial lines, so has the investment of time and energy and commitment to living there. The first point was that of the general area.

South Commons Within the Community-at-Large

The South Commons acreage had been vacant for a number of years. It had not, however, gone unused. Local children abound, and they made good use of Dunbar Park and the empty adjacent spaces. They did not have to go out of their way to find this spot. To the west of the South Commons area are 2132 units of public housing (Dearborn, Ickes, etc.), to the immediately-adjacent east are 529 units of public housing (Prairie Courts). Just east of Prairie Courts is Drake Elementary School; just west of South Commons is St. James School. Both of these are composed of children from both areas - east and west of South Commons. Thus,

for a Prairie Courts child to go to St. James, he cuts west across the South Commons ground; for a Dearborn child to attend Drake, he goes east across the area.

In spatial terms alone, South Commons is not an island; it is a corridor between the west side of Michigan Avenue and Martin Luther King Drive, about five blocks east. It is also a territory which had come to be identified with a group of users, who in turn, saw it as their own. Before South Commons was built, the kids from Prairie Courts hung out at Dunbar School (on King Drive) or at Prairie Courts proper. There is a police station on the corner near the project, which has been held accountable for the lack of major problems with gangs or individual crimes. Others, such as one of the men who taught at the South Commons School, maintain that the guys in the area are just a different kind than those from other projects. He gives as a piece of evidence the fact that the youngsters from Prairie Courts identify with the housing complex as a whole, rather than as residents of a specific building or floor.

What in fact are the demographic characteristics of the neighboring project? There was a dramatic shift in the 1970's within Prairie Courts, the "model" of public housing, which is located across the street from South Commons. Previously, the population was carefully screened, giving it the reputation of one of Chicago's best public housing projects; more recently, the population of the one high-rise (Prairie Extension with 202 units) has been far less carefully screened. Prairie Extension has seen a sudden rise in assistance grants. By also increasing the number of single elderly and elderly couples in that building the C.H.A. has been able to give the appearance of keeping the ratio of children to adults down to 1:6 (after four years of ranging from 1:1.6 to 1:1.7). Today, approximately 70% of the families in Prairie Extension, one block from the Mall in South Commons, are families on Aid to Dependent Children (ADC).

This shift in the type of families at Prairie Courts, when coupled with a shift in the type of families who now live in the moderate income York Terrace of South Commons (families of which many other South Commons people seem to complain), has contributed to a child population in the schools which the adults in both projects tend to believe the worst, both academically and socially. In both instances, the shift in the type of family seems to have been primarily due to careless screening of tenant applications by management, both governmental and private business.*

*It is believed by those who have been involved in this study that the screening policies of the Chicago Housing Authority may have a profound and injurious effect on the children of South Commons and Prairie Courts.

The Chicago Housing Authority statistics on income for Prairie Courts from 1967 to 1972 demonstrates that which its people feel is all too true: "the rich get richer and the poor get poorer..." Except for a period in 1969, there has been a steady decline in the median income of the Prairie Courts population. In relation to present day buying power, one could extrapolate and say there really has been a very serious decline in income. This is made all the more dramatic in its impact by the presence of obviously more affluent people living at South Commons, next door to them.

The child/adult ratio gives the appearance of remaining fairly steady over the years at Prairie Courts, but detailed examination shows that the presence of additional large families was masked by the presence of a large number of elderly and single adults. The statistics are made to look normal by the simple expedient of adding up all the children and dividing by the number of adults. When one considers that 39% of the project is made up of family units with no children, it is easily seen how this is manipulated. In fact, 29% of the "families" consist of one person and 18% of 2 persons, whether two adults or adult with one child, giving a 47% of these small family units. Twenty-five percent of the family units have 4 or more children. Eleven percent of the total family units have six or more children in each family. (There are 37 families with 7 to 10 or more children.)

Two-parent families made up 36% of the population in 1967, and the one-parent family 44%. In 1972, only 19% of the families had two parents, while the one-parent families had risen to 67%.

In 1967, out of 202 family units, 114 received no grants-in-aid, while 88 did receive such aid, 119 grants in all. In 1972, 51 families or 25% received no grants, while 151 or 75% did receive some form of grant. In 1967 out of 119 grants 55% were assistance grants and 45% were benefit or earned grants. In 1972, out of 200 grants in aid, 141 or 71% were A.D.C.. That is an increase of 236%, over 3-1/4 times as many in 1972 as in 1967.

The profile of Prairie Courts is quite different from that of the new complex. By the same token, the median income of Dearborn Homes residents (a few blocks west) is almost $1,000 less than that of Prairie Courts, even though both are below the poverty level. On the other hand, there is a significantly lesser percentage of A.D.C. to total occupancy at Dearborn than Prairie Courts. It is the children from both who plague the security guards at South Commons.

Brute force is not enough of an impediment to trespassing when opposed by curiosity, force of habit, and the questioning of territorial rights. For the sake of the residents at South Commons, the central mall, with its supermarket and stores, was included. It sits in the middle of the

once vacant area, and has provided added incentive for Prairie Courts boys to come around. Indeed, they have taken over the front of the market and its surroundings as their turf. To patrons, they are a source of discomfort at best, and of thieving and verbal abuse at worst. Thus, getting into the store is aggravating.

The boys who hang around also come from the other side of Michigan Avenue, having a very clear track. They go to the market or the drugstore to buy candy and cut back across South Commons, discarding wrappers as they are finished with them. How does this affect the South Commons people? The central area has been disclaimed, and if people wish to sit around, they may choose to do so in their own quadrant sitting area. Some of those who moved in primarily for general convenience and good housing simply do not patronize the shopping area at all. They shop at the market at Prairie Shores, a few blocks away, which is more expensive but less of a hassle.

Beyond the problems outside of the store, the market's manager has chosen to stock the store according to a lower-income Black population's tastes, this, despite a potentially large upper income population. One consequence is more of the poor neighbors are attracted for food-stuffs, and another is that young boys come to buy cheap wine and beer. Many residents do not take advantage of the clothes cleaners for the same reason. One young man from the Windsor high-rise complains that his wife has been accosted by "big boys" every step of the way.

When adults are bothered by such occurrences, their children are not unaffected. But children are also perceptive. South Commons was designed with children in mind, so that, for example, it would not be problematic for a child to cross over to the market or drugstore or even the playground. But they too have been accosted -- and they either become wise in "the ways of the street" or they go into hiding. For example, one townhouse woman reports that for a year or so, her then nine-year old daughter refused to meet her at the market because "there are too many Black kids." She has, however, developed toughness and now she will go to the store, saying "I'm going to hide this" meaning her money. Another townhouse child of the same age when complimented by her mother on "becoming so dark" (from sunning herself) burst into tears and said she does not want to be Black.

Both of these girls are from white, liberal families who moved to South Commons because they were interested in a heterogeneous community. And the mothers of both agree that if anything, their children are growing up far more intolerant than any child reared in the suburbs.

Frustration among children in the neighborhood is mirrored in those living in York Terrace (221-d-3 housing), when they see what play equipment and swimming facilities are available to residents of townhouses and luxury apartments.

Due to FHA regulations, pool privileges are not included in subsidized rents. Children hang around the fences surrounding the pools, after trying to sneak in. Again, it is the York Terrace children who feel the pinch. The pools are a perfect example of semi-public space - they are open to those who live in the respective quadrant or an analogous one. It is, however, very public with respect to visibility and attracts on-lookers. This has also proved to be the case for the public housing children. In addition to their turf being confiscated, it has been enhanced, so that it only proves to be that much more appealing. The York Terrace children and the public housing children are continually involved in feuds with the security guards.

There are only three guards on each shift; so outsiders can sneak in, committing acts of vandalism in the parking areas and the York Terrace courtyard. This in addition to the petty thievery and general aggravation in the central mall prompted the local police community workers to meet with the management company of South Commons and present a compromise arrangement: namely, that the pool at Windsor Mall be opened to the children of the outside community from 2 - 4:30 P.M., daily, during the summer months. It is open to children between the ages of 8 to 18.

The program went into effect in June, 1973, and the subtleties of the pecking order became more evident. Ten minutes before the public swim, the socio-physical transition took place. The children began to gather on the grass, while those women and children at the pool began to gather up their belongings. White and Black vacate the area. Once it is empty, all of the mats are picked up and extra chlorine is put in the pool. The reasoning for the mats is not because of the type of kids, but the masses of them, and the consequent wear and tear.

In such a case, those looked down-upon become aware of the situation. The public housing children are no more destructive during their hours of swim than the upper income children. But there are many more of them at any given time, and they use the privilege to its fullest. It was left to the police to advertise the pool program to the neighborhood at large, and to provide lifeguards, as well as community service aides, to oversee the pool area. On their side, management sent around letters to occupants of 221-d-3 housing, inviting them to participate in the open-pool program - but neglecting to add that the program was for neighborhood children as well.

Needless to say, there were waves of displeasure from all sides. Public housing people were suspicious when ground was first broken for South Commons; the school issue confirmed their initial fears and provided a new obstacle to resolution. Many of the moderate income people at South Commons see themselves as a cut above the latter, and they did not want their children associating with the lower classes. The upper income dwellers were upset, because they had to give up 2-1/2 hours a day of a pleasure they paid for (in their rent) and which had been an attraction to move in the first place. And they did not want their children exposed to

the lower classes. Furthermore, the pool program was used as an excuse for an ease-up in residents' use of the pool later in the day: "People have lost their appetite for a swim", remarked one older woman.

To the contrary, others believe that the construction this year of the third pool has been mainly responsible. At South Commons, the use of the swimming pools has never been overwhelming; white, middle class people claimed it as their territory during the day. Swimming is not particularly an integral part of Black culture; most of the Black residents do not make much use of the facility - or they do so in groupings later in the day. Thus, it is not clear that South Commons has outgrown one or at most two pools, in terms of sociability.

People now complain that they go to a pool and do not see their friends. But there are also three to choose from. The pool area has provided a meeting ground for casual socializing but generally it does not go beyond the pool area. And since the pools are accessible to only one income group, those (and their children) are the ones who come into contact there. Now that there is a third pool near Stratford and the townhouses, a further separation has been fostered between the north end of South Commons and the south.

The Clusters Within

Thus, the problem of mixing occurs not only between public housing residents and South Commoners. Even within the planned community, there is a pecking order, socializing, to a large degree, follows class lines. According to some, the townhouse people look down upon luxury apartment dwellers, who look down upon moderate income dwellers and senior citizens, who in turn look down upon the project dwellers.

Many moderate and luxury families alike moved in for what this exciting new community could and would provide - good housing, a chance to bring up children within the reality of integration (seen in racial terms), while adults could themselves involve themselves in community life. However, South Commons is a community distinctly segregated along socio-economic lines. The bulk of residents are upper class, and the developer gives as the primary indicator of success the continued occupancy of the townhouses and a rise in their value - despite the fact that they are situated just opposite moderate income housing and across the green from public housing. To a certain degree this is possible, because socializing takes place along class lines.

The turnover in population has been racial, rather than economic, given the division between subsidized and nonsubsidized housing. As more Blacks move in at both income levels, resistance to their (or particularly their children) crossing economic lines seems to become even stronger among the more advantaged.

The community spirit is not encouraged by management policy, which asks that people vacate the public spaces by about 10 P.M. Thus, street vitality is lacking - a fact which leads committed city-dwellers to regard the place as sterile. It is not prohibited, but a pallor is cast on the planned in public meeting spots. In Jane Jacobs' terms, one does not have the sense of people watching out over the street - except within individual quadrants. One mistake was putting all of the elderly in one house, off in a corner. As with the cordoning-off of York Terrace, this was a function of government policy for FHA housing. If otherwise, the elderly (as in the old-time neighborhoods) could play the part of guardians of the open spaces, the play areas, the children. All stimuli have been filtered out of their environment. They have the most well-organized building, with tenant's organizations on all of their floors. But many are bored and find something to complain about, because they have been taken out of the street network and put into a 24-story building.

If anything, designed lay-out, in conjunction with company policy, has actively abetted the development of groups within the whole.

> "A question... is raised regarding the location and number of 221-d-3 units, since the 221-d-3 housing generally is located north and east in the project 6 area adjacent to the existing public housing projects, the question is immediately raised as whether this quantity of 221-d-3 housing adjacent to basically a Negro occupied low income public housing area could be successfully integrated on a long term basis, notwithstanding whatever attempts might be made by the developers to achieve such a purpose." (Remarks made in response to the developers' proposal to the Department of Urban Renewal, In D.U.R. Staff Report 1964:20)

The townhouse people formed their own management company, so that their problems of upkeep are theirs. A major reason for turnover in population is basic upkeep.

No one likes to live in shabby surroundings; however, lower income people have lower expectations and are willing to put up with more than those accustomed to better. One of the management personnel has pinned down the situation simply: moderate income housing has to be controlled, upper income housing has to be serviced.

The people in moderate income housing have become aware of the emerging pattern of a discriminating system. At both the high-rise and low-rise of York Terrace, there are very few places to sit. Building

managers insist that there are no company rules against sitting around. Yet, the chief of security maintains that there is a rule against people sitting on their door stoops. And that he has a lot of trouble (especially with the moderate-income dwellers) because they feel that since they paid their rent as tenants, they should be allowed to sit wherever they want. This is reminiscent of any ethnic neighborhood where people have traditionally sat out on the door stoops, feeding into the street network.

The need for visibility may be one aspect of their territorial imperative. Unfortunately, York Terrace accommodates many more people than any of the other sub-areas and gets that much more wear and tear. One new tenant, in describing her living situation, said "York Terrace is nothing but a glorified project." There are maintenance problems with basic house functioning; it is not unusual that smashed hall lights go unreplaced, elevators left jammed, and air conditioning units broken. Some tenants complain that there are few limits placed on behavior; for example, a rough element who are loud and throw things out of the windows are not controlled.

There is also a disparity in landscaping and decorative statuary -- both for sitting and play areas. The York Terrace low-rise accommodates many more children than any other housing cluster. (See map of distribution) The courtyard where the children play has a large sign with instructions on proper use of the space. There is no play equipment for the small children. Day-care facilities are provided in the community center. It is not, however, free. All of the mothers there work and there are many single-parent families. Consequently, there is little supervision and much rough behavior - too many kids and not enough room. The real problem, according to one woman, is within the 14-17 year old range of children, for whom nothing has been provided. They congregate - sometimes as "stoop-sitters" or at a concrete wall on the south side of the York Terrace court. This further upsets neighbors and shoppers. They play music, cards and horse around in general.

The community center would be the obvious answer, but rooms there must be rented. There is the YMCA. In 1971, the director invited the outside community to join forces with interested members from South Commons and the program blossomed. No one at South Commons was willing to work with the York children, except for the Y. The director's feeling was that these people are separate from the rest of South Commons and feel it. It is not dissimilar from the situation with Prairie Courts - those people know they are unwanted. Children pick up on their parents' feelings, wander over to the market area, see a white child and taunting commences.

Many South Commons residents have been very much opposed to the outreach program of the Y, because it has encouraged outsiders to come over. And not a few parents (upper and moderate income alike) have taken their children out, with the excuse that the program has gone downhill.* For advantaged families, this is less of a problem; children can be taken elsewhere. For York families, whose means are limited, it is a problem. It is a perfect example of the snobbism which exists between one economic level and another. Black middle class aspirants at York do not want their children associating with public housing children. Across the street, townhouse parents (not least of all, the Blacks) do not want their children associating with either. One York resident - a white woman married to a Black - maintains that the situation at York is quite different from when she first moved in. She is surrounded by non-articulate people and her children are as well. But when they go to play with other South Commons kids, for example, in the townhouse play area, they are often asked to leave. But, she adds bitterly, it is alright for townhouse residents to use her children as babysitters.

It is difficult to foster a community spirit when there is so much division among the ranks. An observation made in the Department of Urban Renewal report derives from reports on other urban areas:

> New or rehabilitated 221-d-3 housing should be located in an area where the surrounding environment is such that moderate income families will not only be attracted to it but also will desire to remain. (p.16)

At York, the people are fighting to get out; many, just as in upper income housing, expected "their own kind of people." They expected a paradise, having been told untruths, and now they trust few.

The Community: Its Institutional Basis

There is the impingement of South Commons upon its surroundings, and commitment of South Commons residents to their own community. Another observation, germane to the situation, is that 221-d-3 housing tends to take on the same racial occupancy as the area adjacent. (DUR 1964) At first, the ratio of white to Black was 65:35. One of the untruths which had originally attracted the population was the promise of a good school.

The appeal of built-in institutions is particularly great when children are involved; and this is particularly so for moderate income occupants. Statement of Peoples Gas Light and Coke Company of Chicago made in reference to 221-d-3 housing projects in other cities:

*In December 1973, Habitat Management threw the YMCA out of the center, charging them with responsibility for vandalism due to lack of supervision.

> Schools are a very important factor. One of the first considerations of moderate income young parents appears to be the quality of schooling offered. If a rough element attends the local school, young families are reluctant to move into the moderate income housing. If they do move in they soon move to another location if they perceive some real or imagined unpleasantness. (DUR 1964:16)

The elementary school situation at South Commons has been singled out as perhaps the single most important factor in the functioning of the complex. It has been pivotal to the shift in sentiments of South Commons residents, as well as the shift in the racial make-up, away from the original plans for an ideally integrated community.

At the very outset of the planning and design of South Commons, the architects and developers knew that the school situation would be a key issue in the success or failure of the development. A well known sociologist was brought in to prepare an analysis of the school situation and make recommendations that could possibly be implemented by the Chicago Board of Education. His team studied the population of the Drake Elementary School, which services the immediate area of Prairie Courts and Prairie Shores, Dearborn Homes, Longgrove and other housing developments in the area. A thorough survey was made. They tested levels of learning for comparable levels elsewhere. The intention was to create a crash program of federal aid and university assistance to upgrade the quality of teaching and raise the level of class achievement. This would bring Drake School up to par with average or better schools in the rest of the Chicago area.

The investigation culminated in a proposal, directed by the head of the Laboratory School of the University of Chicago. The South Commons school population was estimated to be 710 of elementary school age, 120 of high school age. At that time, the local Drake school was 98% public housing Black.

A number of conclusions were made by the study team, before the building of South Commons: one was that the initial school at South Commons should be built in, or at least be part of the community center, and serve children of the primary grades of kindergarten through third grade, and that it be understood that a grade would be added each year until there would be a full eighth grade school; secondly, there was talk of running the South Commons School as an extension of the Laboratory School of the University of Chicago with University of Chicago personnel; and third, that new programs and equipment should be put into the Drake School to raise its scholastic level, so that the children transferring there at the end of third grade would not suffer a drop in the quality of their education. The forced transfer of children after third grade was rationalized thusly: it would not be a "lonely decision" since a whole class of children would be transferring from the South

Commons branch of Drake over to the Drake Proper, and, hopefully, carrying one's friends would ease the transition. And fourth, the inclusion of children from other projects in each class of the South Commons School would be a useful device easing the transition as well.

The study team's letter of support for the South Commons project to the Department of Urban Renewal was worded thusly:

> Drake School, with 560 vacancies and with a present capacity of 1,225 students, supplies an important asset if proper school community relations are developed. The plans of the South Commons developers and the Chicago City Missionary Society are bold and unique in this regard. Integration of the Drake School must be accomplished on a group basis, rather than by the decision of individual families. This requires developing a large enough pool of white families and white children who will, on a group basis, make use of the Drake School. To this end, the developers and the associated voluntary groups are planning to conduct and subsidize a nursery school in the community building. This enterprise will make possible attracting on a grade by grade basis a balanced and integrated school population which can transfer at the appropriate time to the Drake Public School. If necessary to bring about this type of integration, the developers are prepared to extend the age level of their community school in order to increase the number of white students available for entrance into the public school. (p. 6 of undated, unsigned letter to the Department of Urban Renewal, in staff report of DUR: 1964)

One of the consulting firms in Washington, D.C., sent recommendations on to Mr. Edwin G. Callahan, Acting Assistant Commissioner for Multifamily Housing at FHA in Washington, D.C., after the South Commons bid had been accepted and was underway:

> 9. Sponsors' Intention as to Temporary Character of School Use. As explained at the meeting, it is the expectation of the sponsors that the use of the community space for elementary school purposes will be of temporary duration. (our underlines) The plan contemplates the development of integrated classes in the first four grades, so as to attract families with children to reside in the projects on an integrated basis, both racially and economically. The plan contemplates that when children complete their initial four grades of elementary school education, the entire integrated class would move into a nearby

> public school. There is physical space available in that school now, but at present it is exclusively a Negro school for underprivileged children. Through the process of moving such integrated classes into that school, there will be a gradual integration of that school as a whole. As a result, it is anticipated that, in time, there would be no need for the nonprofit elementary school operation in South Commons. At that time, the daytime use of the community space for such school purposes could be discontinued and the community space would then be fully available during the daytime for other community purposes. (David L. Krooth, of Krooth and Altman, August 11, 1960:4)

These facts of the original plans and the facts told to prospective residents and community people did not mesh. In the original plans, the day care center facilities were allocated to a basement area of York Terrace. This is currently being used as a maintenance office. Those community activists who are pushing for extension of grades suggest the day care center by removed from the community center, and put where originally planned, to make room for more grade-school classes. Others, however, favor using the community building for the day-care program, because they object to the alternative of relegating it to moderate income territory.

None of the aid and equipment for Drake, promised to parents and school personnel, ever materialized; this has fed the fire of distrust of all subsequent school studies proposed. Furthermore, parents of children under observation interpreted the situation to their discredit - that they and their children were not good enough to associate with children from this new private development going up next door.

The implication that local children were scholastically inferior to the newcomers, coupled with the preemption of territory, have remained as the two primary factors for the antagonism toward South Commons by local residents. The time came for the first group of fourth graders to make the change from the South Commons School to the Drake Elementary School. A supportive group of thirty to forty youngsters entering a strange territory had been envisioned. Instead, the children were split up and scattered throughout the number of fourth grade classes at Drake by the well-intentioned principal, who hoped to keep the situation democratic rather than give the appearance of fostering an elite group by letting the South Commons students stay together. The South Commons youngsters were physically victimized by aggressive students at Drake; the latter's hostility had been exacerbated by the resentment of their parents. At one point, the situation was so bad that York Terrace women, whose children attended upper grades at Drake, had to form a human chain to escort the South Commons children to school and home.

The results of this abrasive school situation were evidenced in the population change in South Commons. It was most dramatic in the 221-d-3 housing when the 65% white tenant population began to move out rapidly, to be replaced by moderate income Black families. These latter families also felt the school pressures, and far from feeling they must send their children to Drake for economic reasons, scrimped on budgets to send their children to parochial schools or managed to house children with relatives in other school districts rather than have their children face the harassment of the aggressive and hostile minority of children in the Drake School.

The upper income tenants in rentals and townhouses with children of school age reacted in a number of ways. The fewer the number of children from this economic level that attended the South Commons School, the fewer new students would enroll, thus the effect became circular. Parents who had a child going into the fourth grade would enroll that child in a private school, if possible, and if a younger sibling was about to enter South Commons School, the tendency became that of not even starting in that school, but enrolling the younger sibling in the private school as well. The added financial strain caused a number to come to the decision to simply move out or sell: others who had hoped to stay became discouraged and followed them shortly.

It appears that someone went to the administrative personnel of the Board of Education in 1971, pushing for the addition of more grades to the South Commons School. They were successful: in the Fall of 1972, fourth grade and in 1973 fifth grade were added. The plan called for a school through eighth grade, the balance being added one per year. The District Superintendent of School has not been consulted on any of the implemented changes. The Advisory Council of Drake-South Commons School is duly composed of community people, its roots in the South Commons Community Council of concerned parents. They have been the most visible and listened to. Their concern resulted in a Wieboldt Foundation Grant to study the problems and make recommendations to the Board of Education.

Yet, some white middle-class families have moved out because of the school situation; Black middle-class renters or townhouse owners are facing the same problem. There are 450-500 children in moderate income housing, 135-200 children in upper income housing; an as-yet-unknown number are of school age. But a significant picture emerges from the May, 1973 figures: of the 198 children at Drake-South Commons, only 95 were from South Commons. At the Drake School (fifth to eighth grade) only 31 were from South Commons. And at St. James, a parochial school two blocks away, there were 41 South Commons children. Thus, out of about 650 children, only 167 plus 25 preschoolers (i.e., one-third of the children) are accounted for. The large balance is sent to private schools - Francis Parker, University of Chicago Laboratory School, Howard, St. George, and others.

Mrs. Jesse Harvey is a Black who moved into moderate income housing six months after South Commons opened. Interviewed recently by a reporter, she said:

> The developers did a beautiful public relations job in attracting people here, promising them everything... But somewhere along the line the bottom fell out and Blacks and Whites started moving out. Many things management promised were not forthcoming. They promised a school for the residents, and when they arrived, they found it only went up to third grade. A community of this type must have its own elementary and high school. (Mary Dedinsky "Urban Idyll That Hasn't Jelled?" The Sun Times, 9/1/74:30)

Thus, not only are the neighborhood people embittered; the 221-d-3 residents feel like they have been sold a bill of goods. When the interests of their offspring are at stake, parents become far more actively involved and vocal. Their vibrations do not go unnoticed by the children, who then have another bit of information to process.

CONCLUSION

The conclusions drawn from this preliminary study are interwoven. The theoretical framework of a continuum - of needs and perceptions, behaviors and orientations - has been outlined. On the basis of preliminary study and analysis, it appears that South Commons is composed of autonomous, though inter-connected, fields of relationships. The fields within South Commons are segregated along socio-economic lines. Thus, their intra-connection is as loose as the inter-connection between those of South Commons and those outside. The construction of South Commons has created two parallel situations: one is the incorporation yet very distinct separation of upper and lower income within the bounds of South Commons; the other is the incorporation of South Commons into the neighborhood of Douglas (e.g., not erecting apparent walls which would close it off as distinct and separate) while applying stringent methods to bar the outside from entering. Territoriality and dominance are two major elements of the situation.

A child growing up in South Commons is exposed to children and adults from both within and without. The outsiders are poor. They live across the street in buildings which are noticeably different (i.e., subsidized). The children without South Commons run with their own; the children within do so also. The further complicating factor within is that there is also a noticeable difference, and physical separation between rich and not rich. The moderate housing is a small proportion of the whole, with far more people (especially children) accommodated. The amenities are noticeably absent.

Conclusion: It is suggested that inner-group conflict is a function of class differences rather than race, and that physical design and landscaping reflect such differences and exacerbate them.

The lower income children are unwelcome in the upper-income area; their counterparts across the street (in public housing) are similarly unwelcome in the moderate, or public, area. The dominance/subordinance became manifest in territorial claims: the subordinate group (the poor) have asserted themselves by making claims, particularly of public spaces (Prairie Courts residents re-claiming the once-vacant mall area) and semi-public spaces (the moderate people "hanging out" in the court) and scaring away people who moved there, prepared for a positive experience.

A large number of neighborhood children, or at least their older siblings, were accustomed to using the open space on which South Commons now stands as their own territory; the building of the planned development then dispossessed these children of what they regarded as rightfully theirs. In addition, they have been exposed to the fears and hostilities of their parents vis-a-vis the newcomers at South Commons. Thus, to a certain extent, the neighborhood children return to their former territory both out of habit and antagonism, and, also of course, curiosity. Thus, for example, they pilfer food at the Jewel Tea Company market in the mall, they snatch purses from residents, and they borrow and do not return bicycles. The children of South Commons then generalize from their experience with this behavior, and become more intolerant (not prejudiced) than their peers in middle class suburbs.

Conclusion: the total environment (or experience) must be taken into account in planning such "new towns" or especially inner-city communities. In building within an already-established neighborhood, one must be cognizant of the limitsof tolerability that populations have for each other.

The subordinate group(s) -- those in Prairie Courts and those at York Terrace in South Commons -- was fed by the hostilities of their parents, who became involved in the school issue and saw this as yet another example of the rich taking advantage of the poor. As parents became more and more involved, tensions increased. The importance of the family comes in at this point as the children's incidental exposure to their parents' hostility. This has been true on both sides. As the subordinate group has asserted itself, territorially at least, it has made itself more dominant. Parents of the others become concerned for their own children's safety, and their children sense this.

Conclusion: The school became fundamentally pivotal to interaction and community organization, because as a mere socio-physical institution, it has the quality of bringing together rich and poor. It would provide the territory for otherwise segregated fields to come together, forming a school network (of activity). The school has withered. Thus, there is no catalyst for initiating ties across class lines.

Four hypotheses for further work have emerged:

1) Persons moving into a community out of the desire to live in a mixed (racial, economic, house-type, services, etc.) setting would be more committed to the specifically attracting features.

Corollary 1. Those who move in for reasons of integration (racial, ethnic, socio-economic, etc.) are more likely to move out if integration is not successful, than those who move in for other reasons (convenience, facilities, etc.)

2) Institutions directly affecting children are fundamental to community stability and cohesion.

3) Physical symbols of differentiation must be considered as barriers to cohesion, both between sub-areas within the community and between the planned community and its immediate surroundings.

4) The role of members of the outside community in influencing children's attitudes is an important form of second-order effect (c.f. Bronfenbrenner 1973)

Corollary 1. The planned, inner-city community is one element in the larger urban dynamic.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

References Cited

Armor, David J. "The Evidence on Busing." The Public Interest, 28 (Summer, 1972), 90 - 126.

Anstett, Patricia. The Sun Times, September 26, 1972.

Barnes, J. A. "Class and Committees in a Norwegian Island Parish." Human Relations, VII:39-58.

Bird, Charles, Elio D. Monachesi, and Harvey Burdick. "Studies of Group Tensions: III: The Effect of Parental Discouragement of Play Activities Upon the Attitudes of White Children Toward Negroes." Child Development 23, Number 4 (December, 1952):295-306.

Bott, Elizabeth. Family and Social Network. London: Tavistock Publications, 1957.

Bronfenbrenner, U. "Developmental Research, Public Policy and the Ecology of Childhood." Paper presented at Society for Research in Child Development, Philadelphia, March 31, 1973.

_____. "Toward A Theoretical Model for the Analysis of Parent-Child Relationships in a Social Context" in J. Glidwell, ed., Parent Attitudes and Child Behaviors. Springfield, Illinois: C. C. Thomas, 1965.

Carey, L. and R. Mapes. The Sociology of Planning. London: B. T. Batsford, Ltd., 1972.

Child, I: in G. Lindzey, ed. Handbook of Social Psychology, Vol. II. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc., 1954:655-692.

Coleman, J. Equality of Educational Opportunities. Washington: U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1966.

Dedinsky, M. "Urban Idyll That Hasn't Jelled?" The Sun Times, Sept. 1, 1974:30.

Demerath, N. J. "St. Louis Public Housing Study Sets Off Community Development to Meet Social Needs." Journal of Housing. Vol. 19, 1962, pp. 472-478.

Department of Urban Renewal, City of Chicago. Staff Report 6B, 6C, and 6D. November 12, 1964.

Durkheim, Emile. The Division of Labor in Society. Edited by MacMillan, 1933.

Festinger, L., Stanley Schacter, and Kurt Back. Social Pressures in Informal Groups: A Study of Human Factors in Housing, New York: Harper & Row, 1950.

Leach, Edmund. "Review of the Hidden Dimension and the Silent Language by Edward T. Hall". New York Review of Books, May 23, 1968, pp. 16-18.

Lohman, J. D., and D. C. Reitzes. "Deliberately Organized Groups and Racial Behavior." American Sociological Review, Vol. 19, June, 1954, pp. 342-344.

_____. "Notes on Race Relations in Mass Society." American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 58, November, 1952, pp. 240-246.

Loring, W. L. "Housing Characteristics and Social Disorganization." Social Problems, Vol. 3, No. 3, January, 1956.

McKenzie, R. D. "The Scope of Human Ecology." Publication of the American Sociological Society, 1926, p. 144.

Maccoby, E. "Choice of Socializing Variables." Sociometry, Vol. 23, 1960, p. 357.

Macfarlane, J. W. "Studies in Child Guidance. I - Methodology of Data Collection and Organization. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 1938, 3, No. 6, 1-254.

Mitchell, J. Clyde. "The Concept and Use of Social Networks." Social Networks in Urban Situations. Manchester: The University Press, 1969.

Mussen, P. H., J. J. Conger, and J. Kagan. Child Development and Personality, 2nd ed. New York: Harper and Row, 1963.

Nadel, S. F. The Theory of Social Structure, London: Cohen and West, 1957.

Newman, M. W. "South Uncommons: Architecture and Sociology." Inland Architect, August/September 1969.

Newman, Oscar. Defensible Space, New York: Macmillan, 1972.

New York Times, The. June 10, 1973.

Parr, A. E. "Psychological Aspects of Urbanology," Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 22, 4, 1966, 39-45.

Perin, Constance. With Man in Mind: An Interdisciplinary Prospectus for Environmental Design, Cambridge, Mass. and London: MIT Press, 1970.

Porter, Judith. Black Child, White Child - The Development of Racial Attitudes. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1971.

Radcliffe-Brown, A. R. Structure and Function in Primitive Society: Essays and Addresses, London: Cohen and West, 1952.

Rainwater, L. "Fear and the House-as-Haven in the Lower Class." Journal of American Institute of Planners, Vol. 32, January 1966, pp. 23-31.

Fried, Marc. "Grieving for a Lost Home" in L. Duhl, ed. The Urban Condition. New York: Basic Books, 1963.

_____, and J. Levin. "Some Social Functions of the Urban Slum" in B. Friedman and R. Morris, eds., Urban Planning and Social Policy. New York: Basic Books, 1968, pp. 60-83.

Gans, Herbert. People and Plans. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books Ltd., 1972.

_____. The Urban Villagers. New York: Free Press, 1962.

Hall, Edward T. The Hidden Dimension. New York: Doubleday & Co., 1966.

_____. "Environmental Communication" in Aristide H. Esser (ed.) Behavior and Environment, New York: Plenum Press, 1971:247-56.

Hannerz, Ulf. "Problems in the Analysis of Urban Cultural Organization." Paper presented at Pre-Congress Conference, IXth International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences, 1973.

Heberle, R. "The Normative Element in Neighborhood Relations." Pacific Sociological Review, Vol. 3, No. 1, 1960, pp. 3-4.

Himmelweit, Hilde T. and Betty Swift. "A Model for the Understanding of School as a Socializing Agent." In Paul H. Mussen, Jonas Langer, and Martin Covington, eds. Trends and Issues in Developmental Psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston, 1968, pp. 154-58.

Hunter, Albert. "Local Urban Communities: Persistence and Change." Ph.D. Thesis, University of Chicago, June 1970.

Imoagene, O. "Urban Ecology and Renewal, The Case of Ibadan and Sapele." Paper prepared for the IXth International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences, 1973.

Jacobs, Jane. The Death and Life of Great American Cities. New York: Vintage Books, 1961.

Jencks, C. and M. Smith, H. Acland, M. J. Bane, D. Cohen, H. Gintis, B. Heyns, and S. Michelson. Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America. New York: Basic Books, 1972.

Kagan, J. and N. A. Moss. Birth of Maturity: A Study in Psychological Development. New York: J. Wiley and Sons, 1962.

Keller, Suzanne. The Urban Neighborhood. New York: Random House, 1968.

Kohn, M. L. "Social Class and the Exercise of Parental Authority." American Sociological Review, 23, 352, 1959.

Reitzes, D. C. "The Role of Organizational Structures: Union Versus Neighborhood in a Tension Situation." Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 9, No. 1, 1953, pp. 37-44.

Rosenfeld, H. "A Comparative Behavioral Analysis of Peer Group Influencing Techniques in Head Start and Middle Class Populations." 1967. ED-201-638.

Sears, R. R., E. Maccoby, and H. Levin. Patterns of Child Rearing. Evanston: Row Peterson & Co., 1957.

Sivadon, P. "Adaptation Factors in the Work of Mental Patients." International Journal of Social Psychiatry, Vol. II, No. 2, 1956.

Smith, T. V. and L. D. White (eds.). Chicago: An Experiment in Social Science Research. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929.

Sommer, Robert. Personal Space. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1969.

Stodolsky, S. and J. Jensen. Ancona Montessori Research Prof. for Culturally Disadvantaged Children, 1970. ED-0440166.

Symonds, P. M. The Dynamics of Human Adjustment. New York: Appleton Century, 1946.

Terkel, Studs. Division Street: America. New York: Pantheon Books, 1967.

Trager, Helen and Marion Yarrow. They Learn What They Live, New York: Harper Bros., 1952.

Weaver, Robert C. "Major Factors in Urban Planning," in L. Duhl, ed., The Urban Condition, N.Y.: Basic Books, 1963:97-112.

Whyte, William H. The Organization Man. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1956.

_____. "Please, Just a Nice Place to Sit." New York Times Magazine, December 3, 1972:20-32.

Wilner, D. M., R. P. Walkley, T. C. Pinkerton, and M. Tayback. The Housing Environment and Family Life. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins, 1962.

Williams, John E. and John R. Stabler. "If White Means Good, Then Black ... ." Psychology Today, July, 1973.

Yancey, William L. "Architecture, Interaction and Social Control: The Case of a Large Scale Housing Project." Environment and Behavior, Vol. 3, No. 1, March, 1971, pp. 3-22.